

CEREERAL NEBULA

Vol. 1, #2

1 April 1967

THE CEREERAL NEBULA is a journal of Postal Diplomacy run by a group of Seattle Dippy players (although the editor does most, if not all, of the work) who are attempting to spread the blite of Postal Diplomacy. All correspondence should be directed to the editor: Greg Long, 3526 S.W. 112, Seattle, Wash. 98146

Any literary contributions are particularly solicited although the ed. reserves the right to edit or condense. Any letters concerning rules and what not are also welcomed.

*** C.N. #1 ***
#1900

Until Mr. Boardman designates the following game, it will be C.N. #1. The following positions were chosen by lot except to separate two or more players. Only two of the players are experienced in Postal Dippy, so, anything can happen. So, bare your backs and come out fighting.

England: Dan Evans

3405 Westchester
Bakersfield, Calif. 93309

Russia: Tom Rosenbaum

3411 S. 90th St.
Tacoma, Wash. 98409

France:

Larry Peery
5834 Estelle St.
San Diego, Calif. 92115

(sorry about that Tom)

Germany:

Richard Metzger
227 Reed Hall
University of Chicago
Chicago, Ill. 60637

Italy:

Stephen Haesten
Box 25
Zenith, Wash. 98073

Austria:

John Alden
3401 Hiola
Bakersfield, Calif. 93309

Turkey:

Holand Taudiker
310 Garrison St.
Denver, Colo. 80226

Spring 1901 moves are due on April 21, 1967. Direct moves to Greg Long 3526 S.W. 112, Seattle, Wash. 98146 Game fees must also be paid by that time. Any player who does not send in moves will have his forces stand and if forced to retreat, will have that piece removed from play. Stand by players are may be used when a player drops from play. Players are asked when possible to send retreats along with Spring moves. Also, moves may be asked to be made conditional on a retreat.

GENERAL MEMORANDUM

The following query is posed by Douglas Beyerlein.

" I visited Portland, Oregon between the 19th and 24th of March. During my stay, I played a game of Diplomacy with some of the local players in the area. A situation arose that I think should be re-examined. The same situation came up in CHAUSTARK. I have come up with a different answer than John Boardman however. This was the situation in our game: RUSSIA: Fleet Rum, + Black S,

Army Gal.(S) Army Ser. + Rum.
Army Sev. + Rum.

AUSTRIA: Army Bud.(S) Army Ser.+ Rum.
Army Ser. + Rum.

France :Fleet Con. + Black S,

Now the question is does the Austrian Army Ser. make it to Rumania? In a similar situation in CHAUSTARK John Boardman ruled the whole thing a stand off. Now I do not say that Boardman's ruling was right or wrong because the rule book does not cover things like this. Also, John could rule in his 'zine as he sees fit. Before I give my ideas on this, lets play around with it. Lets say that the Austrian armies stood, would the Russian armies force their fleet out of Rumania? No it would be a stand off. Now if the Russian armies stood, the supported Austrian attack would have dislodged the Russian fleet. So the whole thing depends on whether the Austrian armies attack. Am I winning you over? ((No-ed.))

THE BEYERLEIN COMPROMISE. I hope I have convinced the dissenters that this can easily be looked at in a different perspective. Therefore, my compromise should satisfy the majority. Here is my compromise. The terms: (1) the Austrian Army Serbia does not make it to Rumania, (2) the Russian fleet must retreat from the province of Rumania, (3) the Russian Army does not advance into Rumania. I hope these terms will even out things and make both players involved realize the risks involved.

Unfortunately, in the game in which this happened, we could not come to any definite terms, so the Russian and Austrian players went outside to settle their differences. After a few minutes of bloodshed they came to a draw and after shaking their hands on the matter, the game board was dismantled. My only regret was that I was winning.

((Well Doug, I think your article is quite interesting but the present rule book would support Mr. Boardman's solution to this problem (a stand off.) I assume you are trying to point out that the Austrian attack has not altered the stand off situation. Actually, the Austrian attack has merely validated the supported Russian attack, thus, a stand off. Also, your compromise would have more far reaching effects than you realize. Your compromise would warrant more arguments in cases even vaguely related to the original problem. Without any recognized rules, there would be even more bloodshed.

A situation similar to Doug's was discussed by Richard Shagrin (ed. of HIGH LIVER) and I quite recently. Although involving more variables, it was essentially the same thing. Mr. Shagrin termed my interpretation as a "conditional attack", which is basically this: a supported attack against a unit of the same country will only be valid when it will not dislodge that friendly unit. Thus, so long as the friendly unit is not dislodged, any attack against that unit is valid. Most game masters follow this same ruling.

If anyone has any further thoughts on this subject, I'd like to hear them. Also, Richard Shagrin is going to bring up a situation similar to this one in his zine THE HIGH LIVER. So if you're a little confused, just read his coming issues and you'll be even more so. If you can read the babblings of an overworked computer, I sorry I beat you to the punch Richard. (I ed.)

Richard Shagrin is going to bring up a situation similar to this one in his zine THE HIGH LIVER. So if you're a little confused, just read his coming issues and you'll be even more so. If you can read the babblings of an overworked computer, I sorry I beat you to the punch Richard. (I ed.)

Cerebral Metamorphosis

-or, how to bring up a subject other
gamesters won't condescend to touching

"rather" round you fellow Bippy types

And hear the story bold and clear.

About the clever gamester

Who rouses doubt and fear."

☐ - stink

☐ - retch

☒ - fart

ever, I realize that these are now being pondered; questions
which arise from the following statement
in the rules for Diplomacy under the Support Order: "The exception
mentioned under 'Conflicts' is that an order to move, with support,
against a unit belonging to the same country as the moving or supporting
unit is of no effect; that is, a country may not force one of its own
units to retreat." To me this statement does not show the correct re-
lationship between moving with support against a friendly unit and
dislodging a friendly unit. Particular notice where "that is" is used.
The sentence has stated that to move with support against one's own
unit will dislodge it. Well, moving with support against your own unit
will not always force it to retreat (another unit could support the
unit being attacked) Since these two parts of the sentence are not the
same thing, the statement must be interpreted to have two meanings. i.e.
two separate rules. No knowledge of the game of Diplomacy is needed to
come to this conclusion. Simply ask yourself what would happen if a
sentence intended to relate a rule, which had two parts which are not
the same thing, with a "that is." The only interpretation is two separate
rules.

This argument could be used to support the fellows of the Chalker Rule.
Although I won't use this in my zine I think some explanation should be
given for why the rule is worded in this ambiguous fashion.
Let's see who's the first person to prove me crazy (besides my h.s.)

and the new rulebook

I am against a new rulebook; the present rulebook could be sufficient
as long as the known ambiguities are stated somewhere in the rules. Thus,
a question answer modification could be made as a supplement to the
present rules. This policy is used by the Avalon Hill Co. and has been
quite successful. Since Mr. Galhamer is the only real authority on
Diplomacy, he could very well give his views on the rules and no person
could argue with any authority.

Some thoughts on diplomacy by Noah Webster.

1. Art and practice of conducting negotiations between nations, as in
arranging treaties.
2. Artful management in securing advantages without arousing hostility.

'FACT': - Napoleon is the person most frequently assumed by the mentally
ill.

Another fact. Sic is used to show or emphasize the fact that something
has been copied just as it is in the original. Sic set in brackets is
used to mark an error in quoted matter, or as used by gamesters:
(sic)

Sic is also "American slang" for sick.



2AP1111 April Fool's

redo position a up kind of not pro-
painted of business now exclamation

Well I'm still going. What was it Turner said, "get all the work done on Friday night?" This probably won't get published until the middle of the week.

reter - ☐

And here the story ends and the
reformation of the
"Zee" and the story ends

The CMBRAV NEBULA Gives Full Support to Strategy and Tactics

Maximizing the... I have
something to say for the... a half,
this magazine... articles
expressing... a modest... charged
two per issue... at this... of them
Some of the articles featured in the coming issue are:

1. **THE ARMY ORDER OF BATTLE** (Division and Brigade) - This deals with
avalanche Hill warfare (although a far more detailed account of the Russian
units on the Eastern Front).

2. **A game review of the game that follows, NOVA 42 WAR.** Although I
haven't actually played it myself, I've witnessed a successful campaign
on the part of the... the game includes super, germ warfare and mass
fallout.

3. **REMARKS BY THE** The third installment of perhaps the most popular
article is featured in the next issue. Giving a four step account of
the rules, the creator of the game, Henry H. Bodenstedt, is giving
the history of the Allied breakthrough in Table Top form.

4. **DECEPTIVE MANOEUVRES IN POSTAL GAMES** by Hans Brennecke. Wasn't he
the one who always won those 1-1 attacks?

5. The readers themselves also contribute many fine articles. After all,
they get paid for services rendered.

Although Chris Wagner is editor, S&T is reached though:

...I am against a new...
...as long as the known...
...a question answer...
...present rules. This...
...quite successful...
...Diplomacy, he could...
...could argue with any...
...authority.


...some thoughts on...
...1. Art and practice...
...extending tactics...
...Artful war...
...in securing...
...hostility.

...Napoleon in the...
...III

...B.B. forging C.M.I. forging B.B.
-Long

...the "American..."

Guess what I'll have next issue?



Announcing ?

Oh Yeah! Rod Walker has given us the O.K. to run a section of Imperialism VII in this zine. We will use either the new revised maps, or the old version (there is only a small change in the south.) If you don't have any maps for these games, the current selling price is 25¢. The countries will be selected by lot. The first six people to write will be in. The fee, \$2.00 (unless you wish to contribute to our worthy cause, I don't think I'd better say what its worthy of). Send your \$ to myx accomplice in ignorance: Doug Beyerlein

3934 S.W. Southern
Seattle, Wash. 98116

NEW GAME

A new section of regular Diplomacy is hoped for. Hope, Hope. The next game will have a majority of experienced Postal players. The people who receive this issue are asked to sign up for that game. And I mean YOU!

Concerning team games. Any group of postal players may sign up for a team game. If enough teams write in next issue or before, I will publish the names of and members of the teams. The teams can then select who they want to play. There must be a joint agreement on who's playing who and the countries to be used. A three-man team (three countries) is the type we plan to use. The staff of this zine will not be in any of the games, at least not in this zine. The charge is \$3 for a team. The team captain will collect the zines for the whole team and be in charge of getting moves in on time.

*

In case you're wondering. This zine will only be run on legal size paper for this issue and the next one. This is due to our brilliant material dept. (me, eh, eh,) my own zine doesn't even fit into my filing cabinet. Also, we are using wet ditto on a dry ditto machine. ~~Good Grief! This will soon be corrected.~~ I've got a ream of paper to use up. Anyone for some paper? We even have sten.s, all we need is somewhere to run them off.

I GOT TA END THIS RAG (snore, snore)

Editor, ectisctator, and contribisatator
adress coments to ed.

Greg Long
3526 S.W. 112
Seattle, Wash. 98146

Gamemasters: Greg Long
Doug Beyerlein
Bill Stewart

others: Doug Baker
?
?

If B.B. is Rod Walker?
Is L.B. little brother?

I have just got Greg's masters for the zine and once again he has left out a few things. We will trade all-for-all with any other zine, even Shagrin's. Diplomacy is a register trademark of Games Research Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass. 02118. We already have one person signed up for regular Dippy so do not delay. Response to our zine is great; eight whole letters. Have you ever wondered how we put out this zine without a publsiher? - Beyerlein (boy, my spelling is almost as bad as Greg's) If someone would write us you would not have to read this trash I have to write to fill SPACE.

First Class

3522 S.W. 112th
Seattle 98146

Richard Shapiro
Room 356
U of Wash.
Hagget Hall
Seattle 98105

